

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 24, 2004. Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by *Boag et al.* (U.S. 6,589,291 B1).

Independent Claims 1, 17, and 18 of the present application are directed to conditioning content for presentation at a processing device. More specifically, the content is to be presented according to a content profile and a style sheet associated with the processing device.

In rejecting independent Claims 1, 17, and 18, the Examiner cites *Boag*, asserting that this reference teaches all the elements of these claims. However, it is respectfully submitted that while *Boag* does show some step of determining whether a device can apply style sheets, it does not teach determining a content profile associated with a device and generating a conditioned document according to the content profile. That is, *Boag* merely teaches applying a style sheet to XML content. According to the M.P.E.P. § 706.02, "for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present."

The Examiner does cite column 3, lines 14-19 of *Boag*, in which *Boag* discusses problems in the prior art. However, this section merely states that an invention entitled "Achieving Complex Transformations with Dynamic Style Sheet Coalescing", discloses a novel technique for dynamically determining one or more transformations that may be used to transform an input document in a first notation into a document in a different notation, where the output notation is tailored to (among other things) the target environment where the document will be rendered for presentation. However, *Boag* does not disclose how this is done, nor is there any reference to

determining a content profile associated with a device and generating a conditioned document according to the content profile. Further, this prior invention is not incorporated in *Boag* by reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect in rejecting 1, 17, and 18, as being anticipated by *Boag*, as *Boag* does not disclose every recitation of the rejected claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1, 17, and 18 be withdrawn.

Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-16, they are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on Claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-16 are respectfully requested.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely Claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. Owens III
Reg. No. 51,314
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516
DMO/lah